

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
NORTHERN DIVISION

SHREE HARI, LLC d/b/a ECONO LODGE
and RASIKLAL PATEL

PLAINTIFFS

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:23-CV-597-KHJ-MTP

ACCELERANT SPECIALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY, et al.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' [18] Motion to Stay Proceedings. Plaintiffs ask the Court to stay the attorney conference, disclosure requirements, discovery not relevant to remand, and their responses to the pending dispositive motions until the Court rules on their remand motion. Defendants oppose the request. Plaintiffs have moved to remand, [16], thus Local Uniform Civil Rule 16(b)(1)(B) applies: "A motion to remand . . . will stay the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery not relevant to the remand or referral issue and will stay the parties' obligation to make disclosures pending the court's ruling on the motions." The Court therefore GRANTS in part the [18] Motion to Stay. The attorney conference, disclosure requirements, and discovery are stayed pursuant to the Local Rules pending further order.

The parties must promptly notify the Magistrate Judge of any order denying the Motion to Remand and must submit a proposed order lifting the stay. The parties must confer within 14 days of entry of the order lifting the stay, as required

by Local Uniform Civil Rule 16(b)(1)(C) and 26(f). A telephonic case management conference will be scheduled within 60 days of the lifting of the stay.

Although the Court intends to rule on Plaintiffs' [16] Motion to Remand before ruling on the dispositive motions, that does not relieve Plaintiffs of their obligation to respond to the other pending dispositive motions. *See* [8], [10], [13]. If the Court denies the request for remand, the Court can then rule expeditiously on the remaining motions if fully briefed. Accordingly, the Court DENIES in part the [18] Motion to Stay as to Plaintiffs' responses to the dispositive motions. But the Court will allow Plaintiffs more time to file their responses to those motions. Plaintiffs' responses to the pending motions to dismiss are due by October 29, 2023.

SO ORDERED, this 29th day of September, 2023.

s/ *Kristi H. Johnson*
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE